UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/578,187	05/01/2007	Karl-Ernst Hummel	2190/US	8422
79888 Mann+ Humme	7590 04/27/201 I GMBH	EXAMINER		
Department VR		HAMO, PATRICK		
Hindenburgstr. 45 Ludwigsburg, 71638			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GERMANY		3746		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmanagement@mann-hummel.com james.hasselbeck@mann-hummel.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/578,187	HUMMEL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
PATRICK HAMO	3746		

PAT	RICK HAMO	3746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	ON IN CONDITION FOR A	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the statistic application, applicant must timely file one of the following replaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with time periods:	ame day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, af Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	y Action, or (2) the date set forth an SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ON TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	·).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whi have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensior under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than t may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount ned statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance	with 27 CEP 41 27 must be	filed within two month	os of the data of
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed of A blief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pri	or to the date of filing a brief	, will not be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consider			
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better for 	m for anneal by materially re	educina or simplifyina	the issues for
appeal; and/or	in for appear by materially re	ducing of simplifying	ine issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corres	ponding number of finally re	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	e attached Notice of Non-Co	omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphant / monament	(1 102 02+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>14 and 15</u> would be allow the non-allowable claim(s).	— wable if submitted in a separ	ate, timely filed amend	dment canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) wi how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>14 and 15</u> . Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>10,11,13,16-20 and 22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	un au au Alan daka af Ellium a Ni	- ti f A Iill	* la a la a la desarra d
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but befo because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffi was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	cient reasons why the affidav	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overco showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	e status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does	NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/	SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. ☐ Other:			
/Patrick Hamo/	/Charles G Freay/		
Patent Examiner, AU 3746	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3746	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Currently amended claim 10 incorporates the limitations of examined claim 12. Applicant's arguments with response to examined claim 12 are not persuasive for the following reasons: The limitiation that each cover has "an essentially planar construction facing the central housing part" when read in light of the specification implicates a planar construction in the portion of the cover facing the volutes. For evidence, see the portions of the cover that accommodate compressor 13 and turbine 14 (see figs. 1 and 2, especially). These portions of the cover are clearly not planar, yet do not detract from the "essentially planar" construction insofar as the portion of the cover facing the volutes is still essentially planar. In Roemuss, relied upon in the prior action, the portions of the cover accommodating bolts 19, 22 similarly do not detract from the "essentially planar" construction of the cover facing the volutes, as the volute is fully formed in the central housing part and the portions of the cover closing down on the volutes are planar. Therefore, the rejection of examined claim 12 is maintained.